Life as Attractor, Not Accident: The Information Gap Between Soup and Genome and the Limits of Science-as-God

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

www.youvan.ai

November 28, 2025

In contemporary culture, science is often asked to do more than it was ever designed to do. It is no longer just a disciplined method for testing hypotheses; it has become, for many, the de facto replacement for God. Nowhere is this more visible than in the popular origin-of-life story: given enough time and the right prebiotic soup, a lucky molecule appears, evolution starts, and life climbs out of chemistry by small steps. This narrative functions as a secular creation myth. Yet a simple accounting of information and dynamics in even the simplest bacteria calls it sharply into question. Minimal cells contain genomes measured in roughly a million bits, but their organized "soup" of proteins, metabolites, membranes, and ion gradients embodies orders of magnitude more specific information. The soup is more complex than the genome. Moreover, living cells are not just complex snapshots but non-equilibrium attractors: they occupy dynamically stable regions of state space that resist decay. Any honest origin story must therefore explain both the static information gap and the emergence of a "life attractor." This paper explores how those requirements strain naive naturalism, why they fit uncomfortably with Science-as-god, and how a richer metaphysical frame can honor science without demanding that it be ultimate.

Keywords: abiogenesis, prebiotic soup, information content, minimal bacterium, genome complexity, cell-state information, life attractor, Lyapunov stability, Harold Morowitz, scientific materialism, Science as religion, Logos, irreversible thermodynamics, origin of life, bootstrap problem, RNA world, Urey-Miller, Cech, ribozymes, teleology.

A collaboration with GPT-5.1-Thinking-Extended. 46 pages. CC4.0.

Outline

1. Introduction: Science on the Throne and the Problem of Life
1.1 The cultural elevation of Science from method to metaphysical authority
1.2 The "we crawled out of soup" story as a secular creation myth
1.3 The information gap between genome and soup in minimal bacteria
1.4 From configurations to attractors: the idea of life as a dynamical basin
1.5 Scope and structure of the argument

2. From Method to Idol: Science and "Science"
2.1 Classical science as disciplined humility and bounded competence
2.2 The drift toward methodological atheism and metaphysical ambition
2.3 Science-as-god: total explanation, moral authority, and existential reassurance
2.4 How origin-of-life narratives became liturgy in a secular worldview

3. Counting Bits in the Simplest Bacteria
3.1 Minimal cells as the proper reference point for origin-of-life arguments
3.2 Estimating genetic information in sub-megabase bacterial genomes
3.3 Non-genomic information: proteins, metabolites, membranes, and ion gradients
3.4 Why the organized protoplasm vastly outweighs DNA in information content
3.5 The static ratio: tens of thousands to one in favor of the soup over the genome

4. The Bootstrap Problem: Genome Without Interpreter
4.1 DNA as executable script rather than complete blueprint
4.2 It takes a cell to make a cell: continuity of architecture and state
4.3 Why a lucky replicator in a simple pond leaves most of life unexplained
4.4 The limits of natural selection before fully formed cells exist
4.5 The unpaid information bill in standard abiogenesis narratives

5. Beyond Snapshots: Living Cells as Non-Equilibrium Attractors
5.1 Chemical state space for a minimal cell: trajectories, basins, and manifolds
5.2 Lyapunov functions and exponents: tools for describing stability
5.3 The living cell as a stable non-equilibrium attractor rather than a single state
5.4 Homeostasis, repair, and death as motion within and beyond the basin
5.5 How dynamical stability deepens the bootstrap problem

6. Could There Be a "Life Attractor"?
6.1 Weak life attractors: evolutionary stability once cells already exist
6.2 Strong life attractors: life as a natural basin in driven chemical systems
6.3 Comparisons with known dissipative structures and pattern-forming media

6.4 What physics would need to encode for strong life attractors to be real
6.5 From improbability to directionality: how attractors change the origin question

7. An Atheist's Dilemma: Chance, Laws, and Attractors
7.1 The nightmare of brute chance under the soup narrative
7.2 Deep laws and forms: life attractors as implicit Logos in physics
7.3 Multiverse and anthropic strategies: rare miracles by another name
7.4 Pre-cellular evolutionary cascades: strengths, speculation, and present limits
7.5 What an intellectually honest naturalism must concede about life's origin

8. Logos and Ordered Possibility Space
8.1 Reading life attractors theistically: from brute fact to ordered potential
8.2 Logos as underlying reason, pattern, and mathematical structure
8.3 Information-rich, stable cells as signs of deeper intelligible order
8.4 Science as exploration of a pre-given landscape rather than creator of truth
8.5 Why the soup/genome asymmetry and life attractors point beyond themselves

9. Science Without Worship: Recovering Proper Proportions
9.1 Keeping the method and dethroning Science-as-god
9.2 Teaching abiogenesis with genuine epistemic humility
9.3 Making room for awe, ignorance, and unresolved origins in public science
9.4 How believers and non-believers can share inquiry under acknowledged limits

10. Conclusion: When the Soup and the Attractor Refuse to Be Simple
10.1 Recapitulating the information gap and the life-attractor hypothesis
10.2 Why "we crawled out of soup" is no longer an adequate origin story
10.3 Science as gift rather than god: limits, insights, and responsibilities
10.4 Final reflections on life, order, and the stories we trust about beginnings

Epilogue: Could It From Bit Instantiate a "Life Attractor" ?

References

1. Introduction: Science on the Throne and the Problem of Life

Modern societies often speak about science in a way that quietly exceeds its formal remit. In principle, science is a method: formulate hypotheses, design experiments, gather data, and revise models in light of evidence. In practice, it has been invited to play a much larger role. For many people, science now functions as the final court of appeal on questions of origin, meaning, and destiny. It is not simply a way of knowing; it has become a way of believing. Nowhere is this more evident than in stories about how life began.

The standard secular narrative is simple enough to summarize. On an early Earth filled with reactive gases and energy sources, a chemically rich "prebiotic soup" emerged. Within this soup, by chance and time, a self-replicating molecule appeared. Once replication existed, natural selection activated, and across vast spans of time the first cells emerged. The story is then extended forward: from those cells, through evolution, to everything living today, including those who tell the story. It is intended to close a circle: no Creator required, no Logos needed, only physics, chemistry, and chance.

This paper argues that such simplicity is deceptive. When one counts the information in even the simplest known bacterial cells, the living "soup" appears far more complex than the genome that supposedly explains it. Moreover, living cells are not just complicated microstates, but stable non-equilibrium attractors in chemical state space. Any honest attempt to explain the origin of life must therefore address both a static information gap and a dynamical stability problem. The argument that follows does not reject science. Instead, it questions the wisdom of placing science on a throne it was never meant to occupy.

1.1 The cultural elevation of Science from method to metaphysical authority

The word "science" refers, at its core, to a disciplined practice. Scientists design controlled experiments, deploy mathematical models, and submit their work to critical peer evaluation. The central virtues of this practice are modesty and corrigibility: any claim may be overturned by new evidence, and no theory is beyond revision. This is science as method.

Alongside this modest practice, however, a second layer has grown: an image of "Science" as a comprehensive worldview and metaphysical authority. In this guise, Science is not simply one domain among others, but the arbiter of what is real and important. Questions that cannot be framed in experimentally testable form are often dismissed as meaningless or safely ignored. Public discourse begins to treat "what Science says" as roughly equivalent to "what is ultimately true."

This elevation is not an official doctrine written in textbooks, but a diffuse cultural habit. It appears in slogans about science having "disproved" God, in popular confidence that all mysteries are in principle solvable by existing methods, and in the tendency to present open

questions as if they were nearly resolved. In taking on this role, Science is tacitly asked to replace older sources of meaning and authority. It becomes, functionally, a god-term: expected to provide origin stories, ethical guidance, and existential reassurance.

The origin of life is one of the pressure points where this transformation is most visible. A particular narrative about prebiotic chemistry, self-replicating molecules, and early evolution has been repeatedly used not only as a scientific model, but as proof that blind physical processes are sufficient to account for life. The question is no longer, "What do we know so far?" but, "Has Science shown that no deeper order is needed?" The distinction between method and metaphysics begins to blur.

1.2 The "we crawled out of soup" story as a secular creation myth

The prebiotic soup narrative is often presented in a few compact steps. Early Earth had oceans rich in simple molecules: water, methane, ammonia, hydrogen, and related compounds. Energy from lightning, ultraviolet light, and geothermal sources drove reactions among these molecules, producing amino acids and other organic building blocks. Over time, more complex molecules formed, including polymers capable of storing information and catalyzing reactions. At some point, one of these molecules began to replicate itself, perhaps with errors. With replication and variation in place, natural selection could act. Through countless iterations, the first cells emerged. In informal form, the story condenses to a single slogan: we crawled out of soup.

This story has genuine scientific content. Experiments have shown that simple organics can form under plausible early-Earth conditions, and that certain polymers can catalyze reactions, store information, and undergo limited evolution in vitro. Within those boundaries, the work is real. What elevates the soup story into the role of a secular creation myth is the additional, often implicit, claim that these results show life to be a straightforward outcome of blind chemistry and time. The remaining gaps are treated as engineering details.

For many, this narrative carries existential weight. It offers a universe without purpose or design, yet still capable of producing complexity and consciousness by accident. It reassures those who wish to live without reference to any higher order that the appearance of life, and of their own existence, can be understood without appeal to anything beyond physical law and contingency. In that sense, the soup narrative does not merely describe; it functions to legitimate a particular metaphysical stance.

The argument of this paper does not deny the empirical successes embedded in the story. It questions whether the narrative can bear the metaphysical weight placed upon it once one examines the information and dynamics of even the simplest living cells. When "we crawled out

of soup" is taken as a complete or nearly complete explanation, it does not merely summarize evidence; it exceeds it.

1.3 The information gap between genome and soup in minimal bacteria

To see where the soup story begins to strain, it helps to look closely at minimal bacterial cells. These are cells with exceptionally small genomes and pared-down sets of genes, either found in nature or constructed synthetically. Their genomes may be on the order of a half-million base pairs, encoding a few hundred essential proteins. At first glance, such cells seem like ideal candidates for demonstrating how little is needed to make life work.

Consider the information content of such a genome. With four possible nucleotides, each position carries roughly two bits of information. A genome of half a million base pairs therefore contains on the order of a million bits. That is a small quantity by everyday standards, comparable to the size of a modest digital image. The appeal of genome-centric thinking lies partly in this compression: a tiny string of symbols appears to specify an entire organism.

Now contrast this with the living cell's internal state. At any given moment, the cell contains millions of protein molecules, each with a type, location, and conformational state. It hosts a large variety of metabolites with specific concentrations and spatial distributions. Its membranes have particular compositions and shapes, and they support ion gradients with sharply constrained differences between inside and outside. The cell's ribosomes, chaperones, and complexes form intricate, shifting architectures.

When one attempts to describe this full microstate, even coarsely, the amount of required information rises by orders of magnitude. Rough estimates suggest that the organized "soup" of the cell—its protoplasm, membranes, and gradients—contains tens of thousands or more times the specific information present in the genome. Put simply, the soup is more complex than the DNA. The genome does not enumerate the positions and states of every component; it is a compressed script that presupposes an existing biochemical context capable of interpreting and sustaining it.

This information gap poses a challenge to any origin-of-life story that imagines a simple soup plus a simple replicator as the primary ingredients. It is not enough to imagine that a single strand of nucleic acid appeared and everything else followed mechanically. The living state itself, with its high-information structure, needs explanation. The question is not only, "Where did the genome come from?" but, "How did the dynamic, information-rich soup that interprets the genome arise?" That is the bootstrap problem.

1.4 From configurations to attractors: the idea of life as a dynamical basin

The information gap is already troubling if one treats the cell as a static configuration. But life is not a static configuration. A living cell is a process. Its molecules are constantly turning over. Nutrients flow in; waste products flow out. Energy is drawn from gradients and used to maintain others. The cell exists as a sustained departure from thermodynamic equilibrium, not as a frozen arrangement.

In the language of dynamical systems, one can think of the cell as a trajectory in a vast state space. The coordinates of this space include all relevant chemical concentrations, conformations, membrane shapes, and potentials. To say that a cell is alive is, among other things, to say that its state spends time in a small region of this enormous space: a region where metabolism, repair, and replication are possible. Perturb the system slightly—change an ion concentration, move some proteins, alter a metabolite level—and the internal dynamics tend to bring it back toward that region. Perturb it enough, and the cell dies.

This behavior suggests that living cells correspond not simply to isolated points in state space, but to attractors: basins within which trajectories are drawn toward and held near certain manifolds. The concept of a Lyapunov function formalizes this idea. One can imagine a scalar function on state space that is low in the region corresponding to living states and tends to increase when the system is pushed away from that region. The internal chemistry of the cell, powered by energy flow, acts to decrease this function again, stabilizing the system.

Thinking in terms of attractors adds a dynamical dimension to the origin-of-life problem. The question is no longer only how a particular high-information configuration might have arisen, but how a self-maintaining, non-equilibrium attractor emerged in the first place. A “life attractor” would be a basin in chemical state space toward which physically plausible trajectories are drawn under the actual laws of motion. If such a basin exists, its existence and structure become part of what an origin story must explain.

1.5 Scope and structure of the argument

The remainder of this paper develops the implications of these observations for how we talk about the origin of life and the role of science in providing ultimate explanations. The next section distinguishes between science as a modest, self-correcting method and “Science” as an inflated metaphysical authority. It traces how the latter has come to occupy a quasi-religious role in contemporary culture, particularly around questions of origin.

The third section focuses on minimal bacterial cells. It presents rough but illuminating estimates of the information content in their genomes and compares this with the information embodied in their internal states. The point is not to fix exact numbers, but to show the scale of the disparity between symbolic sequence and organized soup.

The fourth section explores the bootstrap problem: the difficulty of explaining how a sequence that requires a complex interpreter could plausibly arise in a context that does not already contain something like that interpreter. It examines the limits of natural selection prior to fully formed cells and why a lone replicator in a simple pond cannot, by itself, bridge the gap.

The fifth and sixth sections shift to the dynamical systems view, introducing the idea of living cells as non-equilibrium attractors and considering whether there might be, in any meaningful sense, a "life attractor" in chemical state space. They distinguish between weaker and stronger notions of such an attractor and consider what kinds of physical structure would be required for life to be a natural basin of attraction rather than a freak accident.

The seventh and eighth sections examine the philosophical implications. They consider how these issues look from the standpoint of strict naturalism and why they pose a particular dilemma for worldviews that wish to keep physics flat and purposeless. They then outline an alternative reading in terms of Logos and ordered possibility space, in which the intelligibility and stability of living systems point beyond themselves without negating empirical science.

The final sections argue for a recovery of science as a valuable but limited practice rather than a substitute deity. They suggest that origin-of-life research can be conducted and taught with greater epistemic humility, leaving room for genuine uncertainty about ultimate origins. The goal is not to close the question, but to reopen it in a way that is honest about what our current methods can and cannot yet explain.

2. From Method to Idol: Science and "Science"

The information and dynamical issues around the origin of life do not arise in a vacuum. They fall into a cultural landscape in which science has been asked to carry a heavy symbolic load. Many contemporary people no longer stand inside a thick religious tradition, but they still need stories that explain where they came from, tell them what is real, and offer some guidance about how to live. Into this vacuum, a certain picture of science has quietly stepped. The practice of science becomes fused with a metaphysical narrative about a self-sufficient, purposeless universe in which everything, including life, must ultimately be reducible to blind physical processes.

This fusion produces a tension. On one hand, working scientists know that their models are provisional and that entire frameworks can be revised or overturned. On the other hand, the public image of Science is that of a final authority, marching steadily toward complete explanation. The origin of life sits at a fault line between these realities. It is both an open research problem with many unknowns and, simultaneously, a key pillar in a secular story that

treats life as an accident of chemistry. To see why challenges to that story are resisted, one must understand how a modest method became an idol.

2.1 Classical science as disciplined humility and bounded competence

The early architects of modern science framed their work in terms of limits. They did not claim to exhaust reality. Instead, they sought reliable knowledge about certain aspects of the natural world by bracketing questions they could not yet address. The emphasis fell on careful observation, controlled experiment, and mathematical description. The point was not to explain everything, but to explain some things well.

This approach carried with it a certain humility. Hypotheses were proposed as conjectures, not as dogmas. Experiments were designed not to confirm personal preference, but to expose ideas to potential refutation. A theory that survived repeated tests gained credibility, yet remained open, in principle, to further revision. The competence of science was bounded by its own rules: it dealt in repeatable phenomena, quantifiable measurements, and intersubjectively checkable claims.

Many early scientists explicitly acknowledged realms beyond their methods. Some kept theological commitments alongside their empirical work. Others simply recognized that questions of meaning, value, and ultimate origin lay outside the domain of their instruments and equations. Their restraint did not make their science weaker. It made it more precise. By limiting the kinds of questions it would attempt to answer, science gained extraordinary power within its chosen scope.

It is important to recall this disciplined origin, because it stands in sharp contrast to later expectations that science should provide a complete metaphysical narrative. The problem is not with the method as such, but with the gradual expansion of its implied jurisdiction from “things we can measure” to “everything that is real.”

2.2 The drift toward methodological atheism and metaphysical ambition

Over time, a pragmatic decision became a metaphysical stance. In order to conduct experiments and build predictive models, scientists often set aside questions about God, purpose, or teleology. They focused on mechanisms and regularities, treating the world as if it were a closed system of causes. This was methodologically useful. It allowed for clear, testable hypotheses without recourse to intentions beyond the system under study.

This “as if” gradually hardened into “is.” What began as methodological atheism—a temporary bracketing of God talk for the sake of calculation—slowly drifted into the assumption that the universe is, in fact, godless. The success of mechanistic explanations in many domains encouraged the belief that all phenomena, including life and consciousness, must ultimately

succumb to the same style of explanation. A method designed to be neutral with respect to metaphysics came to be read as if it proved a particular metaphysics.

With this drift came an expansion of ambition. Science was no longer framed simply as a powerful way to understand parts of the natural world. It was presented as the path to understanding everything that exists, in principle. Gaps were tolerated as temporary, not structural. Any phenomenon not yet reduced to underlying physics was assumed to be awaiting a proper theory, not to indicate a limitation of the method.

The origin of life became a crucial test case for this expanded ambition. If life could be shown to arise from non-life through purely physical processes, without any appeal to purpose or design, then a major metaphysical barrier would seem to have fallen. The distinction between living and non-living would be blurred into a continuum of complexity. Showing that life could be an accident of chemistry became, for some, emotionally and philosophically important in ways that exceeded the strictly scientific question.

2.3 Science-as-god: total explanation, moral authority, and existential reassurance

As the authority of traditional religious institutions declined in many societies, the image of Science expanded to fill some of the same psychological roles. People turned to scientific narratives not merely for technical understanding, but for existential reassurance. The story that the universe is a vast, purposeless process, within which life and consciousness have emerged through blind evolution, became for some a source of liberation from inherited doctrines. For others, it offered a sense of placement: we are star-stuff that has become self-aware.

In this setting, Science as a cultural symbol acquired functions that classical theology once carried. It was expected to provide an origin story that required no external agency. It was asked to arbitrate disputes about what is real and what matters. It was invoked, sometimes clumsily, in moral and political debates as if empirical findings could directly yield normative conclusions. The phrase “Science says” took on an almost oracular tone in media and public discourse.

This quasi-religious role is not mandated by any particular experiment or theorem. It is a social phenomenon. A community that no longer trusts traditional authorities still needs some framework to legitimate its beliefs and practices. Science, with its undeniable practical successes, is an obvious candidate. Yet the transformation from method to quasi-divinity brings with it certain distortions. It pressures working scientists to speak beyond their data. It encourages the public to treat open problems as if they were nearly solved, because the idea that important questions remain unanswered sits uneasily with the belief that Science is in control.

The origin of life is a focal point for these tensions. A universe in which life is an improbable accident may feel cold, but it is at least self-contained. A universe in which the emergence of life

remains deeply mysterious, with serious conceptual gaps, is more unsettling. It suggests that the metaphysical picture built around Science might be incomplete.

2.4 How origin-of-life narratives became liturgy in a secular worldview

Within this cultural context, certain scientific episodes have been elevated into symbolic rituals. Experiments that produced amino acids from simple gases, or demonstrated catalytic activity in RNA, were not only scientific milestones. They were interpreted, and repeatedly retold, as key steps in a secular creation story. The phrase “we crawled out of soup” condenses decades of work into a single, vivid image.

In textbooks and popular science writing, the prebiotic soup narrative is often presented in a way that downplays uncertainties and gaps. The sequence of events is described as if it were a coherent, nearly continuous pathway from simple molecules to the first cells. Contradictions between different models are smoothed over. Highly speculative steps are narrated in the same tone as well-established findings. The result is less a critical survey and more a liturgy: a rehearsed story that affirms a worldview.

This liturgical function is subtle but real. For a secular audience, hearing that researchers can synthesize organic molecules under early-Earth conditions, or that RNA can both store information and catalyze reactions, is reassuring. It signals that the mechanistic program is on track. Even if no one claims that the full path from non-life to life has been mapped, the impression is that the destination is visible. Life is treated as essentially solved in principle, pending details.

Against this backdrop, pointing to the information gap between genome and soup, or to the dynamical complexity of living attractors, can be experienced as more than a technical objection. It threatens part of a narrative that many have come to rely on as an alternative to religious creation stories. The resistance is not only intellectual; it is also symbolic. If origin-of-life narratives have become a kind of secular liturgy, then questioning their adequacy is felt, by some, as questioning the legitimacy of Science-as-god itself. The remainder of this paper proceeds in full awareness of that sensitivity, while insisting that intellectual honesty requires a fresh look at what has, and has not, actually been explained.

3. Counting Bits in the Simplest Bacteria

If one wants to talk seriously about the origin of life, it is not enough to gesture at “cells” in the abstract. The relevant question is how much organization is required to cross the line from non-living chemistry to even the most minimal living system. That means choosing actual, concrete examples of simple cells and asking how much information they embody. The point of this

section is not to produce exact numbers, which would be impossible given current knowledge, but to establish orders of magnitude. Even rough estimates are enough to show that the internal state of a minimal cell is far more information-rich than its genome.

The approach here is simple. First, take bacterial cells with the smallest known genomes as reference cases. Second, estimate how many bits of information are carried by their DNA sequences. Third, ask how many bits are needed, even conservatively, to describe their non-genomic state: proteins, metabolites, membranes, ion gradients, and spatial organization. The result is a striking asymmetry. The genome looks small and tidy. The soup looks huge and messy. The genome can be written on a page; the soup would require volumes.

3.1 Minimal cells as the proper reference point for origin-of-life arguments

It is tempting to frame the origin-of-life problem in terms of familiar model organisms such as Escherichia coli or yeast. But these are highly evolved, relatively complex cells with large genomes and elaborate regulatory networks. They are not plausible candidates for early life. Any serious attempt to understand what must be explained at the threshold of life should instead look to organisms with far smaller genomes and stripped-down gene sets.

Several natural bacteria, such as certain mycoplasma species, have genomes under one megabase and only a few hundred essential genes. Synthetic biology has gone further, constructing minimal cells whose genomes have been intentionally reduced to the smallest sets compatible with robust growth under controlled conditions. These organisms are not perfect models of primordial life, but they provide valuable benchmarks. They show, in practice, how much biochemical machinery is required to sustain replication, metabolism, and homeostasis in modern conditions.

Using such minimal cells as reference points has two advantages. First, it avoids inflating the origin problem by including functions that are clearly not necessary for bare life, such as elaborate environmental sensing or complex developmental programs. Second, it prevents the opposite error of imagining primordial life as so simple that key constraints are ignored. Minimal cells still require membranes, ribosomes, metabolic pathways, and ion gradients. They represent something close to the lower bound of what a working cell must have.

With these reference organisms in mind, one can begin to ask quantitative questions. How many bits are needed to specify their genomes? How many bits are needed to describe their internal state at a given moment? The answers are very different.

3.2 Estimating genetic information in sub-megabase bacterial genomes

Genetic information is the easier side of the comparison. A DNA sequence is a one-dimensional string over a four-letter alphabet. For a rough estimate, one can treat each position as carrying

about two bits of information, since it can take one of four values. In practice, there is redundancy and correlation, but this approximation suffices for order-of-magnitude reasoning.

Consider a minimal bacterial genome of around half a million base pairs. Multiplying 500,000 positions by two bits per position yields about one million bits. If one prefers bytes, that is on the order of 125 kilobytes. Even if the genome is closer to one megabase, the total information content is only a few million bits, or a few hundred kilobytes. This is small by modern digital standards: less than the size of a typical image attached to an email.

The compactness of the genome has long been a source of fascination. A brief sequence appears to encode an entire cell. That appearance is somewhat misleading, but it has encouraged genome-centric thinking. It is easy to picture the genome as a blueprint in which the organism is "contained," and to imagine that once a self-replicating molecule with sufficient sequence complexity appears, the rest will eventually follow. This intuition is strengthened by the fact that genomes can be sequenced, stored, and manipulated in digital form, while the rest of the cell resists such clean representation.

The crucial point for this paper is that whatever the exact count of bits in a minimal genome, it is relatively modest. One million bits, or a small multiple of that, is not a large number. The question is whether this modest quantity is enough, by itself, to account for the actual complexity of a living minimal cell.

3.3 Non-genomic information: proteins, metabolites, membranes, and ion gradients

The internal state of a minimal cell includes far more than its DNA sequence. At any given moment, the cell contains a population of proteins whose identities, abundances, locations, and conformations matter. It contains a myriad of small molecules participating in metabolic pathways. Its membranes are composed of specific lipids and embedded proteins, arranged in particular geometries. Its ion concentrations differ between inside and outside, and these gradients are maintained within narrow bounds. All of this contributes to the cell's ability to stay alive.

Even rough attempts to count the information in this "soup" produce numbers much larger than the genomic count. To take one example, consider proteins. A minimal bacterial cell may contain on the order of a million to a few million protein molecules. There may be a few hundred to a few thousand distinct protein types. Simply specifying, for each protein molecule, which type it is would require several bits per molecule. Specifying, in addition, a coarse spatial location within the cell requires more bits. Adding information about whether a protein is free or part of a complex, and whether it is in an active or inactive conformation, increases the count further. The total quickly reaches tens of millions of bits for proteins alone, even with conservative discretizations.

Metabolites contribute another large term. A minimal cell contains many different small molecules, often in copy numbers ranging from dozens to millions. To describe their state in a microstate-level way would require identifying each molecule and its position. Even if one settles for specifying concentrations in coarse spatial regions, the resulting description involves many variables with finite precision. Estimating the total information content of the metabolite distribution yields numbers in the hundreds of millions to billions of bits, depending on the level of detail.

Membranes and ion gradients add further structure. The lipid composition of the membrane, its curvature, and the distribution of embedded proteins all carry information. So do the differences in ion concentrations across the membrane and their spatial variations. Each of these features can be discretized into a finite number of possibilities, and each such discretization contributes bits to the total description of the state. These contributions are smaller than those from proteins and metabolites, but they are not negligible.

The precise numbers are less important than the trend. Any realistic description of the cell's non-genomic state, even at relatively coarse resolution, involves many more degrees of freedom than the one-dimensional genome. The information required to specify that state is correspondingly larger. The organized protoplasm is not a simple consequence of the genome; it is an additional, massive reservoir of specific information.

3.4 Why the organized protoplasm vastly outweighs DNA in information content

The disparity between genomic and non-genomic information arises from the difference between a compact script and a detailed snapshot of an entire process. The genome is like a short program that can, under the right conditions, produce and maintain a certain pattern of organization. The protoplasm is that pattern, instantiated in full. Describing the program requires relatively few bits. Describing the complete state of the running system requires far more.

Moreover, the genome cannot function in isolation. It does not spontaneously build its own interpreter. For DNA to be meaningful, there must already exist a translation apparatus, including ribosomes, transfer RNAs, aminoacyl-tRNA synthetases, and the rest of the protein-synthesis machinery. There must be membranes to provide compartments and gradients. There must be a supply of nucleotides and amino acids, as well as metabolic pathways to replenish them. The genome presupposes the presence of a highly structured biochemical environment.

This presupposed environment is precisely what the protoplasm embodies. The spatial arrangement of macromolecules, the fine-tuned concentrations of metabolites, and the delicate balance of ion gradients all contribute to making the cell's processes possible. Many deviations from these specific conditions lead quickly to dysfunction or death. In that sense, the non-

genomic state is not an incidental detail; it is an essential and highly constrained component of what it means for the cell to be alive.

From an information perspective, this means that the cell's state contains large amounts of specificity that are not explicitly enumerated in the genome. Some of that specificity arises as the genome is executed in a particular environment. Some is inherited through the continuity of cell architecture from one generation to the next. Some reflects the interplay between the cell and its surroundings. Whatever its origin, this specificity is real. It represents a reduction in possible microstates relative to the space of all physically allowed configurations. That reduction is measured in bits, and it is large.

The organized protoplasm therefore "outweighs" the DNA in information content because it captures the actual realized constraints on the system, not just the symbolic recipe. The recipe is necessary, but it is only one component of the total informational burden of being a minimal cell.

3.5 The static ratio: tens of thousands to one in favor of the soup over the genome

When one puts these considerations together, a striking ratio emerges. A minimal bacterial genome may carry on the order of one million bits of information. The cell's non-genomic state, even under conservative assumptions, carries at least hundreds of millions of bits, and more plausibly billions. The exact factor depends on the level of detail in the description, but it is robustly large. A ratio of tens of thousands to one between the information content of the soup and that of the genome is a reasonable summary.

This ratio has two important implications. First, it undermines any suggestion that the genome, by itself, nearly exhausts the informational requirements for life. The genome is important, but it is small. The bulk of the specificity that differentiates a living minimal cell from a random configuration of molecules lies in the structured protoplasm. Any origin-of-life model that focuses solely on the appearance of a replicating sequence while treating the surrounding chemistry as generic misses most of what needs to be explained.

Second, the ratio sharpens the bootstrap problem introduced earlier. If the internal state of a minimal cell represents such a large reduction in possible configurations relative to a simple soup, then moving from soup to cell is not merely a matter of lengthening a sequence. It is a matter of climbing an enormous informational gradient. The genome cannot be executed without the complex environment that it presupposes, yet that environment contains vastly more specific information than the genome itself. From a static standpoint alone, before considering dynamics, this poses a serious challenge to narratives in which life emerges gradually from a low-information background by small, unguided steps.

The next section extends this static analysis into the time domain. It examines the idea that living cells occupy non-equilibrium attractors in chemical state space and asks what it would take, not only to configure such a high-information state once, but to generate a dynamical basin that sustains it.

4. The Bootstrap Problem: Genome Without Interpreter

The information disparity between genome and protoplasm is not just a curiosity of counting. It creates a structural difficulty: the genome does not do anything on its own. A DNA sequence sitting in water is inert. For that sequence to be meaningful, it must be read, copied, and acted upon by a pre-existing biochemical system. The cell provides this system in the form of ribosomes, enzymes, membranes, and energy gradients. The origin-of-life question, therefore, is not only how a particular sequence arose, but how a sequence that requires an interpreter could plausibly emerge in a context that does not yet contain one.

This is the bootstrap problem. A minimal cell is a tightly coupled network of processes: transcription, translation, metabolism, transport, and division. The genome encodes many of the components involved, but it presupposes the existence of the network as a whole to make its instructions operative. It is as if a short program required a running operating system and a specific hardware configuration to do anything at all, yet is invoked to explain how that operating system and hardware first appeared. The loop between code and interpreter cannot simply be wished away.

4.1 DNA as executable script rather than complete blueprint

It is common to speak of DNA as the blueprint of life. The metaphor suggests that the genome is a detailed plan from which the entire organism can be constructed. In reality, DNA behaves less like a blueprint and more like an executable script. It specifies the sequences of proteins and functional RNA molecules, and it encodes some regulatory motifs, but it does not, by itself, describe the full architecture of the cell or the conditions under which each element is produced.

An executable script requires a pre-existing environment to run. In a computational setting, this environment includes an interpreter, libraries, hardware, and an operating system. The script assumes that calls to certain functions will be recognized, that memory will be allocated, and that input and output channels exist. Similarly, the genome assumes the existence of ribosomes to translate codons into amino acids, of polymerases to copy nucleic acids, of chaperones to fold proteins, and of membranes to separate internal from external.

The genome also assumes particular ranges of temperature, pH, and ionic strength. Its encoded proteins are stable and functional only within narrow environmental bounds. Outside those bounds, they denature, aggregate, or lose activity. The DNA is therefore meaningful only within a specific biochemical and physical context. Its instructions are conditional on a world already arranged in a certain way.

Seeing DNA as script rather than blueprint clarifies the bootstrap problem. A script can help configure and maintain an environment, but it cannot conjure that environment from nothing. The origin-of-life challenge is not solving an abstract coding puzzle. It is explaining the emergence of a script and an interpreter together, at a level of complexity where each depends on the other.

4.2 It takes a cell to make a cell: continuity of architecture and state

Living cells arise from other living cells. This is not only a historical observation but a functional requirement. During cell division, the genome is replicated and segregated into daughter cells, but so are many elements of the cell's architecture. Membranes are extended and pinched off. Existing ribosomes, enzymes, and complexes are partitioned. Ion gradients are partially preserved or quickly re-established. The daughters inherit not just a sequence, but a partially pre-configured biochemical environment.

This continuity of architecture and state means that many features of a cell are passed down through non-genomic channels. The particular arrangement of membrane proteins, the distribution of metabolic enzymes in space, and the presence of certain complexes are not fully specified by the sequence alone. They are instantiated in the existing cell and copied, in approximate form, through the physical process of division.

From this perspective, the lineage of a cell resembles a chain of overlapping attractors in state space. Each generation starts near the region occupied by its parent and is drawn back into a similar configuration by the internal dynamics of the system. The genome participates in this process by encoding some of the components that maintain the attractor, but the attractor itself is larger than any one sequence. It resides in the whole network of interactions and structures that are transmitted from one cell to the next.

The phrase "it takes a cell to make a cell" captures this dependence. A naked genome in a featureless environment does not spontaneously assemble a cell around itself. Only when the genome is placed within an already living cell, as in genetic transformation experiments, does it become effective. Origin-of-life scenarios that imagine sequences appearing first, with the rest of the cell following, do not align with this fundamental fact of biological continuity.

4.3 Why a lucky replicator in a simple pond leaves most of life unexplained

Many popular accounts of abiogenesis hinge on the idea of a lucky replicator: a molecule, perhaps RNA, capable of copying itself with some fidelity and occasional errors. This molecule is supposed to inaugurate a Darwinian process. By outcompeting less effective chemistries, the replicator and its descendants could, in principle, accumulate complexity over time. The leap from non-life to life is then portrayed as a matter of discovering such a replicator in a plausible environment.

Even if one grants the appearance of this hypothetical replicator, most of the work remains undone. A single replicating molecule in a simple pond lacks membranes, ion gradients, dedicated translation machinery, and structured metabolism. It does not maintain a stable internal environment distinct from its surroundings. It does not carry out the coordinated functions of a minimal cell.

To reach a cell-like organization, the system would need to accumulate not only more sequence information, but also new layers of non-genomic organization. Compartmentalization must arise, both to protect the replicator and to allow gradients to form. Metabolic pathways must emerge to synthesize building blocks and harness energy in reliable ways. Translation systems must evolve to map nucleotide sequences to amino acid sequences in a consistent code. Each of these developments represents a substantial increase in the information content of the system's state.

Moreover, these developments are not independent. A functioning cell requires them to be integrated. Membranes without transporters and energy transduction do little. Complex proteins without reliable translation and folding machinery are unstable. Energetically costly processes need to be linked into a coherent metabolic network. The lucky replicator story, in its simplest form, underestimates the scale of this integration problem.

The replicator may be necessary for open-ended evolution, but it is far from sufficient to explain the organized protoplasm of even a minimal bacterium. Focusing on its emergence risks mistaking a precondition for a solution. The bulk of the informational and structural burden lies beyond the replicator, in the layered system that makes replication part of a larger living process.

4.4 The limits of natural selection before fully formed cells exist

Natural selection is a powerful organizing principle. Given a population of entities that vary, reproduce, and pass on heritable traits, selection can favor configurations that enhance reproductive success. Over time, this process can produce intricate adaptations. However, selection requires a certain minimal infrastructure to operate effectively. Before that infrastructure exists, its power is limited.

In particular, selection requires relatively discrete units of reproduction. In modern biology, these units are cells and organisms. They are bounded, stable enough to persist for some time, and capable of producing offspring that resemble them. Fitness differences can then translate into differences in the numbers or longevity of these units in a population. Without sufficiently distinct and durable units, selection becomes diffuse and weak.

Prebiotic chemistry, as it is often imagined, does not automatically provide such units. A soup of molecules reacting in a shared environment may exhibit complex dynamics, but the boundaries between potential "individuals" are blurred. Replicating sequences may exist, but if they diffuse freely and interact promiscuously, it is not clear that they can form the basis for robust selection at a higher level of organization.

Compartmentalization, such as that provided by membranes or other physical structures, can create proto-individuals. Once molecules are confined to separate spaces with limited exchange, differences between compartments can matter. Some compartments may contain more effective replicators or more favorable chemistries, leading to differential survival. Yet this only shifts the problem. The emergence and stabilization of such compartments, with sufficient integrity and inheritance to support selection, is itself part of what must be explained.

The broader point is that invoking natural selection does not, by itself, solve the bootstrap problem. Selection can shape and refine existing structures, but it needs something to act upon. Before there are systems that resemble cells in their ability to maintain internal conditions and produce offspring, selection operates within a much narrower field. It can favor local improvements in replication fidelity or reaction speed, but it cannot conjure the full architecture of a minimal cell from a chemically undifferentiated background.

4.5 The unpaid information bill in standard abiogenesis narratives

When standard abiogenesis narratives are examined through the lens of information and dynamics, a pattern emerges. They typically focus on steps that increase the capacity for replication and variation: the formation of organic building blocks, the emergence of catalytic polymers, the appearance of self-replicating sequences. Each of these steps is interesting and nontrivial. Each narrows the gap between non-life and life in one dimension.

What these narratives rarely confront directly is the full informational and structural burden represented by a minimal cell. They do not offer a quantitative account of how a low-information soup climbs to a high-information, attractor-like state. They do not specify where the bits required to configure membranes, gradients, metabolic networks, and translation machinery come from, or how they are stored and maintained. They gesture toward selection and time, but they leave the information bill largely unpaid.

This does not mean that all such efforts are futile. It does mean that confidence in a complete, purely mechanistic origin story is premature. As long as the gap between genome and protoplasm remains unaddressed, and as long as the dynamics that stabilize living attractors are poorly understood, the origin of life is not “basically solved” in principle. It is an open problem, both empirically and conceptually.

Recognizing the unpaid information bill does not require abandoning science. It requires being honest about what current models explain and what they do not. It challenges the habit of treating partial successes as if they necessarily extrapolate to full solutions. In the next sections, the focus shifts from static information to dynamical stability, asking what it means for life to be an attractor in chemical state space and how that further complicates, rather than simplifies, the origin question.

5. Beyond Snapshots: Living Cells as Non-Equilibrium Attractors

The information gap between genome and protoplasm is already striking when the cell is treated as a static snapshot. But life is not static. A living cell is a continuous, energy-driven process that persists in time while exchanging matter and energy with its environment. Molecules are constantly being synthesized, degraded, transported, and rearranged. The internal state of the cell at one moment is related, but not identical, to its state at the next. What it means to be alive cannot be captured by a single configuration; it must be understood in terms of trajectories in a high-dimensional space of possible states. This is where the language of dynamical systems becomes useful.

Rather than thinking only in terms of one particular microstate, one can picture the cell’s life as a path through chemical state space. Certain regions of this space correspond to conditions compatible with continued metabolism, repair, and division. Other regions correspond to dysfunction and death. The remarkable fact about living systems is that, under normal conditions, their trajectories remain confined to a narrow band of viable states despite constant disturbances. This behavior is characteristic of attractors: sets in state space toward which trajectories are drawn and within which they tend to remain.

5.1 Chemical state space for a minimal cell: trajectories, basins, and manifolds

To visualize chemical state space for a minimal cell, imagine assigning a coordinate to each relevant variable: the concentration of each metabolite, the number of molecules of each protein, the distribution of ions in different compartments, the degree of membrane polarization, and so on. In principle, this yields a space of enormous dimension. Each point in this space represents a possible instantaneous state of the cell’s internal chemistry and structure.

The actual behavior of the cell corresponds to a path through this space over time. Under stable conditions, this path remains in a relatively small region associated with the living state. Perturbations, such as temporary nutrient depletion or thermal fluctuations, push the state away from its typical trajectory. The cell's internal processes then act to counter these perturbations, restoring concentrations and structures toward their usual ranges. From a dynamical perspective, this indicates that the region corresponding to life forms a basin of attraction.

Within this basin, there may be more specific structures, such as manifolds corresponding to particular phases of the cell cycle or to different metabolic regimes. The cell's trajectory may move along these manifolds while remaining within the overall basin. Crossing certain boundaries in state space, however, might lead to irreversible changes: once outside the basin, the system is no longer drawn back to the living region. In that case, the cell dies.

5.2 Lyapunov functions and exponents: tools for describing stability

Dynamical systems theory provides tools for characterizing such behavior. One of these tools is the Lyapunov function. A Lyapunov function is a scalar function defined on state space that behaves somewhat like an energy landscape: it is lower in states associated with the attractor and higher elsewhere. As the system evolves according to its dynamics, the Lyapunov function tends to decrease, or at least not increase, along trajectories. If such a function can be found, it provides a way to prove that trajectories starting within a certain region will remain close to the attractor.

Lyapunov exponents offer another perspective. They measure the rate at which nearby trajectories in state space diverge or converge. Negative exponents indicate directions in which perturbations shrink over time, while positive exponents indicate sensitive dependence, characteristic of chaos. For a stable attractor, many directions will have negative Lyapunov exponents, reflecting the system's tendency to correct deviations. Some directions may have small or zero exponents, corresponding to neutral evolution along the attractor itself.

Applying these concepts to a minimal cell, one can say that the living state is characterized by a pattern of Lyapunov exponents: many negative directions enforcing homeostasis, some neutral directions describing internal processes, and thresholds beyond which the system enters regions with different stability properties. Although the explicit form of a cell's Lyapunov function is unknown, the qualitative behavior of living cells—returning to functional states after modest disturbances—suggests that such a function exists in an effective sense.

5.3 The living cell as a stable non-equilibrium attractor rather than a single state

The notion of a non-equilibrium attractor captures a key feature of life: it persists far from thermodynamic equilibrium by continuously dissipating energy. A dead cell drifts toward

equilibrium as gradients collapse and reactions proceed toward maximum entropy. A living cell, by contrast, maintains gradients, cycles, and structures by coupling them to energy sources such as chemical fuels or light. It does so in a way that makes certain configurations robust and self-maintaining.

Seen this way, the living state of a minimal cell is not a single point in state space but an attractor set. The cell's actual microstate fluctuates within this set as molecules bind and unbind, react, and move. What remains stable is the structure of the attractor itself: the overall pattern of flows and constraints that keeps the system within a viable region. The genome contributes to this structure by specifying components of the network, but the network's behavior as a whole is a property of the combined dynamics of many interacting parts.

This perspective reinforces the earlier point that the genome is only a small part of the informational burden of life. The attractor embodies not just the identity of individual molecules, but their collective behavior under the laws of chemistry. It encodes, in its shape, which perturbations will be corrected and which will be fatal. That encoding is distributed across the network, not localized in a single sequence.

5.4 Homeostasis, repair, and death as motion within and beyond the basin

Homeostasis, the maintenance of internal stability, can be understood as motion within the basin of attraction. When environmental conditions change or stochastic events alter internal variables, the cell's state is pushed away from its typical trajectory. Feedback mechanisms—such as sensors that adjust metabolic fluxes, channels that open or close to restore ion balance, or chaperones that refold misfolded proteins—act to steer the state back toward regions where key functions operate properly. These corrective motions correspond to trajectories descending along the Lyapunov function toward lower values.

Repair processes, such as the removal of damaged components and the synthesis of replacements, can be seen as more elaborate excursions within the basin. The system temporarily moves into regions where repair pathways are active, then returns to its ordinary manifold. As long as the perturbation does not carry the system beyond certain critical thresholds, the attractor's stability ensures recovery.

Death occurs when the state crosses those thresholds. Once outside the basin of attraction, the dynamics no longer pull the system back toward life. Instead, they carry it further away, toward chemical equilibrium or toward other, non-living attractors. Membrane integrity is lost, gradients collapse, macromolecules degrade, and the finely tuned network of interactions dissolves. From the standpoint of state space, the trajectory has left the living region and entered a qualitatively different domain.

This dynamical picture emphasizes that life and death are not simply labels on static configurations, but descriptions of how the system behaves over time in response to disturbances. The boundary between life and death is a boundary between regions of state space with different stability properties.

5.5 How dynamical stability deepens the bootstrap problem

Introducing attractors and Lyapunov stability into the discussion does not alleviate the origin-of-life problem; it intensifies it. The question is no longer only how a particular high-information configuration could have arisen from a low-information background. It is how a non-equilibrium attractor with the right stability properties could have emerged in the first place.

To produce a minimal cell, prebiotic processes would need to do more than assemble molecules. They would need to organize those molecules into a network with the capacity to maintain itself against perturbations, drawing trajectories into a narrow basin and keeping them there while energy is available. This requires a specific pattern of feedbacks, couplings, and flows. The attractor's structure is itself a form of information about which reactions should be linked, how they should be buffered, and how the system should respond to deviations.

In other words, the origin story must account for both the static information gap and the dynamic stability of the living state. It must explain how the chemical state space came to contain a basin in which a minimal cell can exist, and how prebiotic trajectories ever found their way into that basin. Simply positing a lucky replicator in a simple soup does not address this. A replicator without an attractor remains a fragile curiosity, easily lost to fluctuations and competing reactions.

Recognizing living cells as non-equilibrium attractors thus deepens the bootstrap problem. It highlights that life is not just a particular arrangement of molecules, but a structured region of state space with strong restorative tendencies. Any adequate origin-of-life theory must explain the emergence of that region and its accessibility under real conditions, not only the existence of certain molecules in isolation.

6. Could There Be a "Life Attractor"?

If living cells behave as non-equilibrium attractors in chemical state space, a natural question follows: are they isolated curiosities, or do they sit within a broader tendency of matter and energy to organize in life-like ways? In other words, is there such a thing as a "life attractor" in the dynamics of driven chemistry? The answer depends on what one means by the phrase. There is a modest sense in which life already functions as an attractor once it exists. There is also a stronger, more ambitious sense in which life would be a natural destination for certain

classes of non-living systems. Distinguishing these senses clarifies both the promise and the cost of invoking attractors as part of origin-of-life thinking.

On the modest side, life clearly shapes its own future trajectories. Given cells, heritable variation, and environments, evolution tends to discover and stabilize certain metabolic and structural configurations. These are, in a broad sense, attractors in genotype–phenotype space. On the stronger side, the idea that life is an attractor means that sufficiently rich, driven chemical systems, even without pre-existing cells, would tend to evolve toward cell-like organization. That stronger claim, if true, would profoundly alter the way we think about life's origin. It would replace a story of raw improbability with a story of hidden directionality. But it would also demand a great deal from the underlying physics.

6.1 Weak life attractors: evolutionary stability once cells already exist

Once living cells exist, they participate in evolutionary dynamics that produce relatively stable configurations. Certain metabolic solutions recur because they are robust and efficient. Certain structural motifs, such as lipid bilayers and protein folds, persist because they solve common physical problems in reliable ways. Ecological relationships between species can settle into patterns that endure for long periods. These phenomena can be described as weak life attractors in the sense that, within the space of possible organisms and ecosystems, some regions are much more likely to be inhabited than others.

For example, when bacteria colonize a new environment, their metabolic networks often evolve toward similar structures, even when starting from different genetic backgrounds. This convergence suggests that the combined pressures of energy harvesting, waste removal, and resource competition favor particular designs. Likewise, in multicellular organisms, certain body plans and developmental pathways appear repeatedly across lineages. The details vary, but the overall forms and functions are constrained by physics and by the logic of growth and reproduction.

These weak attractors operate on timescales of many generations. They depend on the existence of cells that can reproduce and on selection acting on differences in reproductive success. They do not tell us why cells exist in the first place. They do, however, show that once life is present, its dynamics are not random wanderings through possibility space. There are ridges, valleys, and basins in the landscape of viable forms. Evolution tends to channel populations into these regions and keep them there until conditions change.

Recognizing these evolutionary attractors is important, but they cannot be confused with a solution to the origin question. They describe the structure of life's possibilities after the basic machinery of cells is in place. The stronger question is whether there are attractors that operate at the pre-cellular level to make the emergence of cells themselves more than a mere accident.

6.2 Strong life attractors: life as a natural basin in driven chemical systems

The notion of a strong life attractor goes beyond evolutionary stability. It proposes that, under appropriate conditions, driven chemical systems have a natural tendency to evolve toward life-like organization, even in the absence of pre-existing cells. In this view, life is not an isolated fluke but a typical outcome of certain classes of non-equilibrium processes. Given enough time and the right flows of energy and matter, trajectories in chemical state space would be drawn into basins corresponding to proto-cells and, eventually, to minimal living systems.

For such a claim to hold, the relevant attractor must satisfy several conditions. It must be accessible from a reasonably broad set of initial states, not only from finely tuned configurations. It must be robust under noise and perturbations, so that once trajectories enter its basin, they do not immediately fall out. It must support the emergence of compartmentalization, metabolism, and replication in some coordinated fashion. In other words, the attractor must encode much of the structure that we have already seen is required for a minimal cell.

If a strong life attractor exists in this sense, it significantly changes how one might think about the origin of life. Rather than asking why a specific, highly improbable configuration occurred, one would ask why the laws of physics define a pattern of dynamics in which life-like organization is a likely long-term outcome. The improbability is shifted from a particular event to the global structure of the underlying rules. The difficulty does not disappear, but it moves to a different level.

6.3 Comparisons with known dissipative structures and pattern-forming media

There are precedents for attractor-like behavior in non-living systems. In certain reaction–diffusion systems, spatial patterns such as stripes or spots emerge spontaneously from homogeneous initial conditions. In fluid dynamics, convection cells or vortices can form stable structures that persist as long as energy is supplied. Sand dunes, cloud formations, and other large-scale phenomena display organized patterns that arise from the interplay of simple physical laws and continuous flux.

These dissipative structures share some features with life. They are maintained by flows of energy and matter, and they can exhibit stability and regularity in the face of fluctuations. Their existence shows that far-from-equilibrium systems do not necessarily relax to featureless equilibrium states. Instead, they can fall into ordered regimes that act as attractors in appropriate state spaces.

However, these physical structures differ from life in crucial ways. Their organization is generally simple and repetitive. They do not store and process symbolic information in the manner of genetic systems. They do not exhibit open-ended adaptive evolution or the capacity to

construct complex internal machinery. Their attractors, while genuine, are shallow in informational terms compared to the attractor represented by even a minimal cell.

Comparisons with these systems suggest that the existence of dissipative attractors is not in doubt; what is in doubt is whether the specific, high-information attractor corresponding to life arises naturally in the same way. The gap between a convection cell and a cell with a genome, translation apparatus, and regulated metabolism is vast. It is not obvious that the existence of the former makes the latter inevitable. If life is an attractor, it is an attractor of a different, more elaborate kind.

6.4 What physics would need to encode for strong life attractors to be real

For a strong life attractor to be a genuine feature of the universe, the underlying physical laws must do considerable work. They must define a space of possible interactions among molecules in which certain complex networks are not only permitted but favored under realistic boundary conditions. These networks must be capable of self-maintenance, error correction, and reproduction. Moreover, the path from disordered chemistry to these networks must be navigable by local dynamics, without improbable global coordination.

This implies that the laws governing molecular interactions embody more than generic tendencies toward equilibrium. They must contain, in their structure, constraints that make specific kinds of organization dynamically stable. At a minimum, they must support molecules that can simultaneously serve as catalysts and templates, lipids that spontaneously form compartments under common conditions, and reaction pathways that couple energy release to the building and repair of complex structures. These features are indeed found in biochemistry, but the question is whether they arise inevitably from deeper physical principles or whether they represent a highly contingent subset of what is possible.

If one claims that life is a natural attractor of driven chemistry, one is implicitly claiming that the laws of nature encode a preference for life-like organization. This is a strong statement. It does not follow from the bare fact that chemistry can form complex molecules. It requires a particular arrangement of possibilities in which the basin corresponding to minimal cells is wide and deep enough to capture trajectories from a variety of starting points.

From a purely descriptive standpoint, this is not impossible. One could imagine a universe in which the laws are such that life appears whenever conditions allow. The cost of this view is metaphysical: it replaces the problem of a singular unlikely event with the problem of why the laws are so finely structured as to favor life. The attractor, if real, raises questions about deeper order rather than removing them.

6.5 From improbability to directionality: how attractors change the origin question

The idea of a life attractor shifts the origin-of-life discussion from pure improbability to implicit directionality. In the absence of attractors, one might picture life as the outcome of a rare fluctuation in a vast space of possibilities. The story would then hinge on whether that fluctuation is plausible given the size and age of the universe. With attractors, the story becomes different. It is no longer that a particular configuration happened against overwhelming odds, but that the dynamics themselves pull systems toward certain regions.

This change has two main consequences. First, it makes the emergence of life seem less like a miraculous accident. If life is an attractor, then given suitable conditions, one might expect life or life-like systems to appear again and again. This expectation underlies some thinking about life elsewhere in the universe. Second, it forces one to confront the question of why the dynamics have this particular structure. Directionality is not free. If the flows in state space tend toward life-like organization, that tendency is itself a fact about the universe that demands explanation.

From the perspective of this paper, the introduction of attractors deepens rather than dissolves the tension between Science-as-god and the reality of life. On the one hand, a genuine life attractor would offer comfort to those who want a fully naturalistic origin. It would suggest that life was bound to happen somewhere. On the other hand, the existence of such an attractor would highlight the presence of a deep, life-favoring order in the fabric of physical law. That order would look, in many respects, like a built-in preference for living organization.

In that sense, attractors do not eliminate the need for metaphysical reflection. They move it from the level of particular events to the level of general structure. The question changes from “How did this improbable cell arise?” to “Why does the universe have laws that make life a natural attractor?” For those who see the world in terms of Logos or underlying reason, this shift is congenial. For those committed to a flat, purposeless universe, it poses a new and more subtle challenge.

7. An Atheist’s Dilemma: Chance, Laws, and Attractors

The picture developed so far puts a particular pressure on strict naturalism. If life is treated as a low-information accident in a simple soup, the information gap between genome and protoplasm and the dynamical reality of living attractors make that accident look implausible. If life is instead treated as the natural outcome of deep laws and attractors in chemical state space, then the laws themselves begin to look strangely hospitable to life, as if they contained a kind of implicit preference for high-information, self-maintaining organization. Either way, a

tension emerges. The universe looks less indifferent and more structured around the possibility of life than many naturalists are comfortable admitting.

This section sketches that tension in more detail. It describes the nightmare of brute chance under the soup narrative, explores the idea that life-friendly attractors function as implicit Logos within physics, considers multiverse and anthropic strategies as ways of diluting improbability, and assesses pre-cellular evolutionary cascades as partial but incomplete responses. It closes by asking what an intellectually honest naturalism must concede, given the current state of knowledge about life's origin.

7.1 The nightmare of brute chance under the soup narrative

In the simplest version of the soup narrative, life is a fluke. A particular arrangement of molecules in a prebiotic environment just happened, by chance, to have the right properties. It could replicate, however imperfectly. It could, in combination with its surroundings, initiate a process that eventually led to cells. The improbability of this initial event is acknowledged, but it is often dismissed with appeals to vast timescales and huge numbers of trials. Given enough time and enough molecules, the reasoning goes, even very unlikely events will happen somewhere.

The information and dynamical analysis developed earlier makes this comfort harder to sustain. Even a minimal cell embodies a static information content many orders of magnitude greater than that of its genome. Its living state corresponds to a non-equilibrium attractor in chemical state space, with strong restorative tendencies and specific responses to perturbation. To imagine that such a high-information attractor was reached by a random walk from a low-information soup, without significant guiding structure, is to imagine an extraordinary fluctuation.

It is not simply a matter of one molecule with a useful property appearing. It is a matter of assembling a tightly integrated system of compartments, gradients, networks, and codes, all arranged so that trajectories in state space are drawn into the basin of life and remain there. The probability of stumbling into such an attractor by unguided motion in a vast space of possibilities, starting from generic conditions, appears vanishingly small. The nightmare, from an atheist standpoint, is that the numbers refuse to cooperate. The origin story starts to resemble a miracle in all but name.

7.2 Deep laws and forms: life attractors as implicit Logos in physics

One way to escape this nightmare is to shift the burden from chance to law. Instead of picturing life as a freak fluctuation, one can posit that the universe's laws are such that life-like organization is a natural outcome of certain classes of driven systems. In this view, life is not an accident but a tendency: a basin in the dynamics that is wide and deep enough to capture

trajectories from many starting points. The attractor is not merely a feature of specific chemistries but an expression of deeper regularities.

This move has an immediate appeal. It preserves naturalism by keeping all causes inside the physical system, while reducing the dependence on improbable coincidences. It aligns with the intuition that if life is possible here, it may be possible elsewhere under similar conditions. It also resonates with phenomena already observed in non-living systems, where pattern and order emerge spontaneously in far-from-equilibrium settings.

At the same time, this move quietly introduces something that looks, in structural terms, like Logos. If the laws of physics define a state space in which life is a natural attractor, then those laws encode a kind of form: a pre-existing structure of possibilities that favors self-maintaining, information-rich organizations. The universe is no longer a neutral container of arbitrary events. It is written in such a way that living systems are among its expected outcomes.

One does not need to name this structure as divine. One can simply call it “deep law” or “fundamental regularity.” But functionally, it behaves like an implicit Logos: an underlying order that shapes the space of what can stably exist. For a worldview that hopes to keep physics flat and purposeless, this is an uncomfortable development. Life-friendly attractors built into the laws make the universe look more like a designed environment and less like an indifferent accident, even if no designer is explicitly invoked.

7.3 Multiverse and anthropic strategies: rare miracles by another name

Another escape route from the improbability problem is to multiply the stage. If life is extremely unlikely in any given universe, one can posit many universes, or many domains within a larger structure, each with different initial conditions or even different laws. In a sufficiently large multiverse, the argument goes, configurations as complex as minimal cells, or entire biospheres, will appear somewhere. We should not be surprised to find ourselves in one of the rare places where this has happened, because only in such places can observers exist.

This anthropic strategy dilutes improbability by spreading it over an enormous ensemble of trials. It does not change the probability in any one domain; it simply adds more domains. The event that looked like a miracle in a single-universe setting now looks like an eventuality in a vast multiverse. The soup narrative becomes statistically plausible by expanding the arena beyond anything directly observable.

From a logical standpoint, this move is coherent. From an explanatory standpoint, it has a peculiar character. It replaces a single unlikely event in one universe with a large set of universes in which that event is bound to occur occasionally. The fine-tuning required for life appears not in the laws of our universe alone, but in the structure of the multiverse that gives rise to such laws. The “miracle” has not disappeared; it has been relocated to a higher level.

Anthropic reasoning also has limited predictive power. It can tell us that we should expect to observe conditions compatible with our existence, but it does not specify in detail what those conditions must be or how life emerges from them. It functions more as a consistency check than as a constructive mechanism. For the origin-of-life question, this means that multiverse and anthropic arguments can defend the possibility of extreme improbabilities but cannot, by themselves, explain how the specific informational and dynamical features of minimal cells arise.

7.4 Pre-cellular evolutionary cascades: strengths, speculation, and present limits

A third response is to propose that life did not arise in a single leap from soup to cell. Instead, it emerged through a long cascade of pre-cellular evolutionary stages. Autocatalytic chemical networks, simple compartments, and primitive replicators may have coexisted and coevolved, gradually building up the structures needed for full cellular life. In this picture, selection-like processes operate at lower levels of organization, favoring networks that sustain themselves and compartments that happen to enclose beneficial chemistries.

This kind of scenario has genuine strengths. It acknowledges that the jump from non-life to life is too large to be explained in a single step. It distributes the informational and structural burden across multiple transitions. It aligns with the general pattern of evolution, in which complex systems arise from simpler systems through cumulative change. It also invites specific experimental programs, such as studying protocell systems or autocatalytic sets in the laboratory.

At the same time, these cascades are, at present, largely speculative. There is no agreed sequence of stages that has been demonstrated to be both chemically plausible and sufficient to yield minimal cells. Different models emphasize different mechanisms, and many of the intermediate steps remain hypothetical. Most importantly, the overall information accounting is rarely made explicit. It is not yet clear how much each stage contributes to reducing the space of possible states and how the combination of stages bridges the full gap from soup to attractor.

There is also the issue of dynamics. Pre-cellular cascades must do more than create interesting chemistries; they must generate stable, self-maintaining structures able to evolve further rather than dissipating. That means they must embody, in embryonic form, the same kind of attractor properties that fully formed cells exhibit. The extent to which known prebiotic systems approach this level of robustness remains uncertain.

None of this is to dismiss pre-cellular evolutionary models. Rather, it is to place them in context. They are promising lines of inquiry, but they have not yet demonstrated a complete solution. They soften the bootstrap problem in principle by inserting intermediate rungs on the ladder,

but they have not yet shown in detail how the whole ladder reaches from generic chemistry to minimal cells.

7.5 What an intellectually honest naturalism must concede about life's origin

Given these tensions, what should an intellectually honest naturalism say about the origin of life? There are several minimal concessions that seem difficult to avoid.

First, it must acknowledge that the origin problem is not solved in principle by current models. The existence of self-replicating molecules, pattern-forming chemistries, or protocell-like structures does not yet amount to a quantitative, dynamical account of how high-information, attractor-like minimal cells arise from low-information soups. The information gap, the interpreter problem, and the need for robust basins in state space remain substantial.

Second, it must recognize that appealing to deep laws, life-friendly attractors, or multiverse ensembles carries metaphysical commitments. These moves may preserve a naturalistic ontology, in the sense that everything is still described in terms of physical processes, but they do not restore a picture of a flat, indifferent universe. They introduce structured possibility spaces in which life-like organization has a special status, either as a favored outcome or as a selected rarity in a vast ensemble. That status is, in itself, a kind of order that calls for explanation.

Third, it must admit that some degree of faith is involved. Not religious faith in a narrow doctrinal sense, but confidence that the world is, in fact, closed under the methods and assumptions of naturalism, despite unresolved questions. This confidence may be reasonable or unreasonable, but it is not mandated by the current state of empirical knowledge. It is a philosophical commitment layered on top of scientific practice.

None of these concessions force a naturalist to abandon their position. One can reasonably hold that, although the origin of life is not yet understood, future work will eventually illuminate it within a naturalistic framework. One can prefer deep-law or multiverse explanations to theistic ones. The point is simply that such preferences should be recognized as preferences, not as straightforward deductions from existing data.

In the context of this paper, the dilemma for atheism is not that science points directly to God, but that the combination of information, dynamics, and attractors makes any simple, self-contained origin story increasingly difficult to defend. Chance, laws, and ensembles each carry their own costs. The universe looks more structured around the possibility of life than a thin materialism would predict. How one interprets that structure—whether as a hint of Logos, as an ultimate brute fact, or as something else entirely—remains a metaphysical choice.

8. Logos and Ordered Possibility Space

If one stops treating life as an isolated curiosity and instead looks at it as a high-information attractor in a deeply structured physical world, it becomes natural to ask whether that structure itself has any deeper meaning. Up to this point, the discussion has been largely negative: the simplicity of the "we crawled out of soup" story is at odds with the static information content of minimal cells and the dynamical realities of living attractors. This section considers a more positive possibility. Perhaps the difficulty is not merely that the standard narrative is incomplete, but that it is being asked to operate inside too thin a metaphysical frame.

In many religious and philosophical traditions, the idea of Logos names an underlying reason or pattern in which the world participates. Logos is not a rival to the laws of physics; it is a way of saying that the laws themselves, and the possibility spaces they define, are intelligible and ordered rather than brute. Reading life and its attractors in this light does not amount to a proof of any particular theology. It does, however, offer a way of interpreting the same empirical facts without reducing them to ungrounded happenstance.

8.1 Reading life attractors theistically: from brute fact to ordered potential

A strong life attractor, if it exists, is a remarkable feature of the universe. It would mean that, under certain conditions, the combined dynamics of molecules, energy flows, and boundary structures tend to produce systems that maintain themselves, process information, and reproduce. In a strictly naturalistic frame, this is taken as an ultimate fact. The laws happen to be such that life is a natural outcome; no further question is considered necessary or meaningful.

A theistic reading does not deny the existence of such an attractor. It asks what kind of reality would make such an attractor unsurprising. Instead of treating life-favoring structure in physics as a brute coincidence, it interprets it as a reflection of ordered potential in the world's foundation. Life is then not merely what happens to emerge, but something for which the universe is, in some deep sense, prepared. The basin in state space is not an accidental wrinkle; it is an expression of underlying intentionality or purpose.

This does not require constant intervention or violation of physical law. It is compatible with an image in which the laws themselves are the means by which an ordering mind or principle expresses its intentions. A universe written so that life is a natural attractor is, in this view, a universe whose possibility space has been deliberately shaped. The life attractor is not an argument that forces belief, but it is consonant with the idea that the world is more like a poem or a score than like a random string of symbols.

8.2 Logos as underlying reason, pattern, and mathematical structure

The term Logos has a long history. Philosophically, it has been used to refer to the rational structure of reality: the patterns, ratios, and regularities that make the world intelligible. Mathematically, it resonates with the fact that the laws of physics can be formulated in compact equations that describe an enormous range of phenomena. The existence of such laws, and the human capacity to discover them, is itself a kind of mystery. Why should nature be both ordered and comprehensible?

Within a Logos framework, the deep regularities encoded in physical law are not arbitrary. They are manifestations of an underlying reason. The specific structures of symmetry, conservation, and dynamical flow that define the space of possible behaviors are not treated as brute givens, but as expressions of a more fundamental rationality. On this view, mathematical elegance and physical fruitfulness are two aspects of the same underlying logic.

When life enters the picture, Logos takes on an additional dimension. The patterns that make possible high-information, self-maintaining systems are part of the same ordered fabric. Reaction networks that can support metabolism, molecules that can carry and process symbolic information, and structures that stabilize non-equilibrium attractors are not isolated curiosities; they are particular realizations of a deeply organized potential. Logos is not just the abstract symmetry behind particle interactions. It is the ordered possibility space within which living systems can exist at all.

8.3 Information-rich, stable cells as signs of deeper intelligible order

Minimal cells sit at the intersection of several layers of order. At the microscopic level, they rely on the chemical properties of atoms and molecules, including detailed shapes, charges, and reactivity. At the network level, they embody circuits of reactions that achieve robust outcomes despite fluctuations and noise. At the dynamical level, they inhabit attractor regions in state space where perturbations are corrected and overall structure is maintained. Each of these layers involves constraints that rule out the vast majority of physically allowed configurations.

From an informational standpoint, the existence of such systems implies an extraordinary narrowing of possibilities. Out of all the ways in which particles could be arranged and could interact, the universe contains tiny regions where arrangements yield stable, reproducing, information-processing entities. The actual cell is one instance of such a region. Treating it as a mere accident in an otherwise indifferent landscape underestimates how much ordering work is being done beneath the surface.

In a Logos perspective, the layered specificity of cells is a sign of deeper intelligible order. It suggests that the universe is structured not only to permit chemistry, but to permit the emergence and persistence of systems that embody and use information in sophisticated ways.

The fact that minimal cells can be analyzed with the tools of thermodynamics, information theory, and dynamical systems is itself part of the sign. They are not opaque anomalies. They are intricate, but they are not arbitrary. Their intelligibility, however partial, points back toward an underlying rationality that precedes both life and the human mind.

8.4 Science as exploration of a pre-given landscape rather than creator of truth

Seen through this lens, science looks less like a constructor of reality and more like an exploration of a pre-given landscape. Scientists do not create the laws of nature by writing equations; they discover approximations to regularities that are already there. They do not decree which attractors exist in chemical state space; they uncover and characterize them. The work of origin-of-life research, in particular, becomes a search for the pathways and structures by which the world's pre-existing order permits the rise of living systems.

This perspective restores a certain modesty to science without diminishing its importance. If the landscape is real and ordered before any theory is proposed, then success in modeling it is a testimony to the fit between human reason and the world's structure. Failure or incompleteness in modeling is not a disaster; it is a sign that more exploration is needed. The fact that current abiogenesis theories leave large informational and dynamical gaps is then a statement about the limits of our current maps, not about the absence of structure in the territory.

Science as exploration also changes how one thinks about ultimate questions. If the possibility space within which life attractors exist is itself contingent and intelligible, then the question of why it has this structure rather than another is not one that science can close by itself. It can describe the landscape, uncover local regularities, and even identify attractors. It cannot, by its own tools, answer why there should be a landscape amenable to such description in the first place. That question belongs to a different level of discourse, one that Logos language is designed to address.

8.5 Why the soup/genome asymmetry and life attractors point beyond themselves

The asymmetry between genome and soup, and the reality of living attractors, do not force any particular metaphysical conclusion. They do, however, create a pattern that resists reduction to simplistic narratives. A minimal cell is vastly more information-rich than its genome alone. Its living state occupies a dynamical basin that maintains itself against perturbations. The path from generic soup to such a state is not yet understood in detail, and the existing proposals involve either extreme improbabilities, deep life-favoring laws, or unobservable ensembles.

In themselves, these facts are descriptive. They tell us that life is, at minimum, a complex and highly constrained phenomenon. What makes them point beyond themselves is the way they interact with our expectations. If one began with the assumption that the universe is thinly structured and indifferent, one would not predict the ready existence of high-information

attractors capable of sustaining self-reproducing systems. One would expect chaotic flux punctuated by relatively simple patterns, not deeply organized, symbol-processing networks that persist for billions of years.

The actual situation is different. The physical world contains at least one example of a system—life—that embodies and manipulates information far beyond what naive probabilistic intuition would suggest, given a "simple soup" starting point. It does so in a way that is mathematically characterizable and experimentally accessible. For some, this is a cue to search for ever more sophisticated naturalistic mechanisms. For others, it is a cue to ask whether the frame in which only such mechanisms count as explanations is itself incomplete.

Interpreting these features in terms of Logos is one way of acknowledging that they fit more comfortably in a world that is ordered at depth than in a world that is merely a stage for accidental events. The point is not that the soup/genome asymmetry and life attractors prove anything theological. It is that they sit more naturally within a picture of reality as an ordered possibility space, grounded in an underlying reason, than within a picture of reality as a flat expanse of brute facts. They invite, rather than compel, a move from a thin metaphysics of chance to a thicker metaphysics of order.

9. Science Without Worship: Recovering Proper Proportions

If science has been placed on a throne it never asked for, the remedy is not to tear it down, but to put it back in its proper place. The practice of disciplined observation, experiment, and modeling has yielded enormous insight into the workings of the natural world. It has given us tools to heal, to build, and to understand. The problem arises only when this method is inflated into something it is not: a comprehensive world-explaining and meaning-giving authority. In the context of life's origin, this inflation shows up in the pressure to tell a complete story even when the available evidence does not yet justify one.

Recovering proper proportions means affirming the strengths of science as a method while refusing to confuse it with a total worldview. It means allowing origin-of-life research to proceed energetically, but without treating tentative scenarios as if they were settled facts. It means acknowledging the limits of current knowledge without embarrassment, and allowing those limits to be part of what we teach and communicate. In short, it means science without worship: respect without idolatry.

9.1 Keeping the method and dethroning Science-as-god

The first step in restoring balance is to distinguish clearly between science as a set of practices and "Science" as a cultural symbol. The practices—careful measurement, reproducible

experiments, mathematical modeling, peer criticism—are valuable precisely because they subject ideas to empirical constraint. They are at their best when they are modest, when they do not claim more than the data support, and when they remain open to revision.

The symbol, by contrast, is what happens when these practices are treated as the sole arbiter of reality and meaning. In that guise, Science is invoked to answer questions far beyond its remit. It is asked to declare what ultimately exists, to settle moral disputes, and to provide a story of origins that excludes any appeal to deeper order. There is no need to attack the practices to critique the symbol. One can remain a strong defender of empirical rigor while refusing to treat Science as a replacement deity.

Dethroning Science-as-god therefore does not mean returning to intellectual chaos. It means reasserting that methods have domains of competence and that origin questions cross boundaries those methods cannot erase. In the case of life's origin, this involves saying openly that current models are partial, that they leave large informational and dynamical gaps, and that drawing sweeping metaphysical conclusions from them is unwarranted. It is possible to be committed to scientific inquiry and, at the same time, skeptical of the cultural habit of turning incomplete theories into final answers.

9.2 Teaching abiogenesis with genuine epistemic humility

The classroom is one of the main places where the mythic version of abiogenesis is quietly reinforced. Students are often presented with a smooth progression: simple molecules, prebiotic soup, amino acids, polymers, self-replicating RNA, protocells, and finally fully fledged cells. Each step may be illustrated with experiments or models, and the sequence as a whole can leave the impression of a nearly continuous and well-understood pathway. The gaps are not necessarily hidden, but they are rarely emphasized.

A more honest approach would keep the same empirical content but change the tone. When teaching abiogenesis, one can clearly distinguish between three categories: well-established findings, plausible but incomplete models, and open mysteries. The formation of certain organic molecules under simulated early-Earth conditions belongs in the first category. Hypotheses about RNA worlds or metabolic-first scenarios belong in the second. The full transition from low-information soups to high-information, attractor-like minimal cells belongs, for now, in the third.

Teaching with this level of epistemic humility does not weaken science education. It strengthens it by showing students how real inquiry works. They see that science is an ongoing process, not a finished edifice. They learn to appreciate both the power and the limits of current methods. They also see that acknowledging uncertainty is not a failure, but a form of intellectual integrity.

Origin-of-life research can then be presented as an exciting frontier, not as a settled justification for a particular metaphysical stance.

9.3 Making room for awe, ignorance, and unresolved origins in public science

Public communication of science often shies away from saying “we do not know,” especially on topics that carry metaphysical weight. There is a fear that admitting uncertainty will undermine trust or open the door to pseudoscience. As a result, narratives are smoothed, caveats are minimized, and open questions are framed as if they were minor details rather than central puzzles. The origin of life is a prime example. The story is told as if it were, in essence, understood, with only the finer points awaiting clarification.

Making room for awe and ignorance in public science involves a different posture. It means being willing to say, plainly, that the emergence of life from non-life remains a profound mystery in many respects. It means presenting the information gap between genome and protoplasm, and the dynamical reality of living attractors, as part of what makes life remarkable. It means treating the unknown not as an embarrassment to be concealed, but as a source of legitimate wonder.

Such honesty does not invite arbitrary speculation. It can be combined with clear explanations of what distinguishes serious origin-of-life research from unfounded claims. It can stress that ignorance in one area does not invalidate well-established knowledge in others. What it changes is the attitude: instead of projecting an image of near-omniscience, public science can model humility and curiosity. In doing so, it leaves conceptual space for people to wrestle with ultimate questions without feeling that they must choose between blind faith in Science-as-god and rejection of scientific findings altogether.

9.4 How believers and non-believers can share inquiry under acknowledged limits

Once science is no longer tasked with being the sole source of metaphysical comfort, it becomes easier for believers and non-believers to share the same investigative space. They can agree on empirical methods and standards of evidence while disagreeing about how to interpret the larger significance of what is found. The origin of life then becomes a domain where different metaphysical perspectives can coexist without constant conflict, provided the limits of current knowledge are respected.

For believers, the information content of minimal cells and the structure of life attractors may be seen as signs of deeper order, hints of Logos. For non-believers, the same features may be taken as challenges to be addressed within a naturalistic framework, or as brute facts with no further explanation. What both can agree on is that understanding the chemistry and dynamics of prebiotic systems is a worthwhile scientific goal, and that progress will depend on careful experiments, models, and open debate.

Acknowledged limits are the key. If neither side claims that current abiogenesis theories have closed the question in principle, then room remains for ongoing conversation. The believer need not dismiss scientific work as irrelevant or hostile. The non-believer need not wield partial models as weapons against all forms of theism. Both can cooperate in exploring the structure of the chemical landscape that makes life possible, even while disagreeing about why that landscape exists.

Science without worship, in this sense, is science practiced and taught in a way that is maximally hospitable to shared inquiry. It honors the method, resists its elevation into an idol, and keeps the space of ultimate interpretation open. In the context of life's origin, this means taking the information and dynamical demands of minimal cells seriously, refusing simplistic narratives, and allowing the remaining mystery to be what it is: an invitation to deeper thought rather than an occasion for premature closure.

10. Conclusion: When the Soup and the Attractor Refuse to Be Simple

The appeal of the "we crawled out of soup" story lies in its simplicity. It promises a clean, continuous path from non-life to life: simple molecules, a chemically rich pond, a lucky replicator, and then evolution doing the rest. For many, this narrative has carried not just explanatory weight, but existential comfort. It seemed to show that life, including human life, is one more outcome of blind physical processes in a purposeless universe. But when one takes seriously the actual complexity of even the simplest known cells, both in static information terms and in dynamical behavior, that simplicity evaporates. The soup and the attractor refuse to be simple.

This paper has tried to show why. The information in a minimal genome is modest compared to the information in the organized protoplasm it presupposes. The living state is not a random configuration but a non-equilibrium attractor in chemical state space, with strong stability properties and layered feedbacks. The path from a generic soup to such an attractor is not yet known, and the existing proposals—whether they lean on chance, deep law, multiverse ensembles, or pre-cellular cascades—each carry their own unresolved costs. Against this backdrop, the cultural elevation of Science from method to metaphysical final word looks less like clear thinking and more like wishful compression.

10.1 Recapitulating the information gap and the life-attractor hypothesis

The starting point was a simple count. Minimal bacterial cells, with genomes on the order of a million bits, embody internal states whose specification requires many orders of magnitude more information. The proteins, metabolites, membranes, and ion gradients of the living soup form a highly constrained configuration space, one that is vastly smaller than the space of all

physically allowed arrangements. The genome is an executable script that presupposes an interpreter; the interpreter is the organized protoplasm. The script is small. The interpreter is huge.

To treat these cells as static objects already stretches the naive soup narrative. To treat them dynamically stretches it further. A living cell is not a single point in state space but a trajectory within an attractor basin: a region where perturbations are corrected, gradients are maintained, and structure persists as long as energy flows. The idea of a "life attractor" emerges naturally in this context. At minimum, cells are attractors once they already exist. More strongly, one can ask whether driven chemical systems have a built-in tendency to evolve toward cell-like attractors even from non-living starting conditions.

If such strong life attractors exist, they change the character of the origin question. Life becomes less a freak fluctuation and more a sign of deep directionality in the underlying dynamics. But that directionality is itself a fact about the universe that calls for interpretation.

10.2 Why "we crawled out of soup" is no longer an adequate origin story

Against this background, the slogan "we crawled out of soup" looks less like a sober summary of evidence and more like a metaphysical placeholder. It skips over the information gap between genome and soup. It glosses over the bootstrap problem of sequences that require interpreters emerging in contexts where interpreters do not yet exist. It ignores the dynamical realities of living attractors, in which stability, repair, and reproduction depend on finely tuned networks of processes.

Simple appeals to chance underestimate the scale of the climb from low-information soups to high-information attractors. Simple appeals to natural selection overestimate what selection can do before robust, reproducing compartments exist. Simple appeals to pre-cellular cascades remain, at present, long on possibility and short on demonstrated pathways. None of this means that abiogenesis research is misguided. It does mean that current stories are not entitled to function as completed secular creation myths.

In short, "we crawled out of soup" is not falsified as a loose metaphor for some unknown sequence of events. It is inadequate as a confident, nearly closed explanation. The soup is more complex than the genome. The attractor is more structured than the metaphor allows. Any honest origin story must take both facts seriously.

10.3 Science as gift rather than god: limits, insights, and responsibilities

One way forward is to change how we hold science itself. As a method, science is a gift: a remarkably effective way of probing the structure of the world, testing ideas against reality, and refining our understanding. Applied to origin-of-life questions, it has already revealed much

about prebiotic chemistry, molecular self-organization, and the constraints that any viable scenario must satisfy. It will undoubtedly reveal more.

As a god, however, Science is a poor idol. Expecting it to provide complete answers to questions of ultimate origin and meaning, especially when key empirical and conceptual pieces are missing, burdens it with a role it cannot fulfill. The result is a subtle pressure to overstate what is known, to smooth unresolved complexities, and to treat open problems as nearly solved. This does not serve science well. It erodes trust in the long run and obscures the genuine wonder of the unknown.

Treating science as a gift rather than as god carries responsibilities. It asks scientists and educators to communicate clearly where the frontiers and gaps lie, especially in emotionally charged domains like life's origin. It invites metaphysical modesty, acknowledging that empirical success does not, by itself, settle questions about why the laws are the way they are, or why the possibility space of the universe includes life-friendly attractors at all. It allows room for different philosophical and theological readings of the same data, without demanding premature closure.

10.4 Final reflections on life, order, and the stories we trust about beginnings

The existence of life—of even a single minimal cell—is already remarkable. It represents a convergence of information, structure, and dynamics that is not easily dismissed as a trivial outcome of generic chemistry. Whether one interprets this convergence as a sign of deeper Logos, as an ultimate brute fact, or as a challenge that future naturalistic theories will eventually meet, it deserves to be faced squarely. Simplistic reassurance does not honor the depth of the phenomenon.

The argument of this paper has been that both the soup and the attractor point beyond themselves. The soup is not a featureless background; it is a medium whose organization must itself be explained. The attractor is not just a metaphor; it is a real, dynamical structure that stabilizes an extraordinarily specific region of state space. Together, they expose the thinness of narratives that pretend to have domesticated life's origin under the banner of Science-as-god.

What remains is not a neat alternative story, but an invitation. It is an invitation to let science do what it does best—probe, model, test—while refusing to let its current results be weaponized into metaphysical finality. It is an invitation to allow mystery where mystery genuinely remains, without abandoning rigor or retreating into obscurity. It is an invitation to reconsider the possibility that the universe is not merely capable of life, but, at some deep level, hospitable to it in ways that fit more naturally in a picture of ordered possibility than in a picture of featureless chance.

In the end, the stories we trust about our beginnings shape how we live. If the story is that everything important is already explained in principle, we may become careless about what remains unknown. If the story is that nothing is intelligible, we may lose confidence in inquiry altogether. Between these extremes lies a harder but more fruitful path: to live and think in the tension between what we know and what we do not, letting the stubborn complexity of the soup and the attractor keep us honest, humble, and open to deeper order.

Epilogue: Could It From Bit Instantiate a "Life Attractor" ?

The argument so far has stayed mostly within a familiar order: molecules first, patterns second, meaning last. We started from soup, counted bits in genomes and protoplasm, introduced attractors to describe living dynamics, and then asked what kind of laws could make such attractors possible. Even when we invoked Logos, the direction of explanation tended to run from physics upward, with metaphysics hovering above as interpretation.

The phrase "it from bit" quietly inverts that order. If physical "it" truly arises from informational "bit," then matter and energy are not the ground floor. They are downstream expressions of a more fundamental informational structure. In that case, the deep question is no longer whether chemistry could accidentally assemble a life attractor. It is whether the informational substrate could be such that life attractors are among its natural, perhaps even expected, realizations.

This is speculative territory by design. An epilogue is allowed to ask questions the main text is not ready to answer. But given how much of the paper has turned on information and stability, it is worth at least sketching what changes if "bit" is taken as primary rather than as a bookkeeping device applied after the fact.

Suppose, as some interpretations of "it from bit" suggest, that the universe at its most basic level is informationally structured. The elementary distinctions that define physical states—this quantum outcome rather than that one, this field configuration rather than another—are not epiphenomena of matter, but the raw material out of which matter is constituted. In such a picture, physical law is not just about forces and fields; it is about allowed patterns of bits and the transformations between them.

If that is so, then attractors in state space are not just lucky regularities in a chaotic sea. They are signatures of deeper informational constraints. The existence of a convection cell, a chemical oscillator, or a spiral galaxy already testifies that the underlying "bit-structure" of reality favors certain stable, self-organizing configurations. The fact that these structures can be analyzed and predicted suggests that they are not arbitrary. They arise because the rules governing bit transformations define basins in the space of possibilities.

A life attractor, in this context, would be a particularly rich and intricate basin in the informational landscape. It would not be a single microstate but a region in which patterns of bits corresponding to compartmentalization, metabolism, and replication reinforce one another. The genome would be one layer of pattern, the protoplasm another, the dynamical flows that keep the system away from equilibrium yet another. All of them would ultimately be patterns in the same underlying "bit fabric."

What does this gain us? At first glance, it might seem like a mere change of language. Molecules become patterns of bits; state space becomes an abstract configuration space of information. The gap between soup and cell, between non-attractor and life-attractor, remains. But the inversion does something subtle. It moves the question of plausibility from brute matter to structured information. Instead of asking whether atoms banging around in a primordial ocean could, by chance, assemble a cell, one asks whether the legally allowed transformations of bits in the universe include trajectories that naturally converge on life-like attractors.

If the answer is no, then "it from bit" simply sharpens the improbability problem. Life becomes not only a rare arrangement of matter, but a rare region of the informational code space, one that is technically possible but not especially favored. The origin of a minimal cell would then resemble a highly atypical bug in a vast program: conceivable, but not something to be expected often. In that case, the tension for strict naturalism increases rather than decreases. Not only the molecules but the underlying bit dynamics would seem indifferent to life, making its actual appearance even more striking.

If the answer is yes, however, a different picture emerges. If the permitted transformations of bits in this universe are such that high-information, self-sustaining attractors are dynamically favored under certain boundary conditions, then life is not riding on the surface of a meaningless computation. It is one of the things the computation is intrinsically good at producing. The "life attractor" is then an informational feature of the universe, not just a biochemical accident. In that case, it becomes more natural to think of life not as an intruder in an alien landscape, but as one of the canonical outputs of the underlying code.

This brings the discussion back into the orbit of Logos, but now in explicitly informational terms. Logos can be thought of as the deep rational structure that makes certain patterns of bits lawful, stable, and intelligible. If "it from bit" is true in a robust sense, then Logos is not something overlaid on matter from the outside. It is the grammar of distinctions and transformations that make any stable "it" possible, from electrons to enzymes to ecosystems. A life attractor is then a kind of long, elaborate sentence written in that grammar: highly nontrivial, but still syntactically legal.

From this vantage point, the soup/genome asymmetry takes on a different flavor. The genome looks small because it is a compressed description of one layer of pattern. The soup looks huge because it embodies many layers of pattern simultaneously: chemical, spatial, dynamical. But both are local expressions of a global informational logic. The bootstrap problem—how a script that needs an interpreter could arise in a world without interpreters—becomes a question about how the underlying bit-dynamics can generate coupled patterns at multiple levels that mutually sustain one another. It is still a hard question, but it is now phrased in terms of code and constraint rather than in terms of blind collisions alone.

Science, viewed from within this informational frame, remains the same method but gains a deeper rationale. It is the practice by which finite minds reconstruct pieces of the bit-structure that gives rise to observable regularities. When biochemists map out metabolic pathways or characterize molecular machines, they are uncovering fragments of the code that define the life attractor. When origin-of-life researchers build models of protocells, they are testing whether certain hypothetical informational patterns are dynamically viable under the constraints of the actual universe.

What changes is the temptation to treat the code as self-explanatory. If the informational substrate is rich enough to instantiate life attractors, consciousness, and perhaps even minds that can reason about the substrate itself, then simply labeling it “bit” does not dissolve the mystery. It may, in fact, sharpen it. Where did such a code come from? Why does it have this structure rather than another? Why does it contain within it the latent possibility of systems that can ask these questions?

These are not technical questions that can be closed by better simulations of prebiotic chemistry. They are questions about why there is an ordered informational possibility space at all—why there is any Logos-like structure in which life attractors make sense. A strict naturalism may choose to accept the bit-structure as a final brute fact. A theistic or Logos-centered view may see it as one more entry in a long list of signs that the universe is, at depth, rational and hospitable to meaning.

Either way, the main theme of the paper persists into this epilogue. Whether we speak of molecules in soup or bits in an underlying code, life refuses to be a small, easily explained perturbation on an otherwise featureless background. It appears, instead, as a high-information, dynamically stable attractor whose very existence pushes us to think more carefully about what kind of world could give rise to such a thing. If “it from bit” is more than a slogan, then the life attractor is not an afterthought in that informational world. It is a clue to the character of the bits themselves.

References

Works on entropy, information, and minimal cells

This subsection would assemble foundational works that connect thermodynamics, information theory, and the physical basis of living cells, with special attention to minimal or near-minimal systems and their energetic and informational constraints.

Schrödinger E., *What Is Life? The Physical Aspect of the Living Cell* (Cambridge University Press, 1944).
Shannon C. E., "A Mathematical Theory of Communication," *Bell System Technical Journal* 27 (1948): 379–423, 623–656.
Brillouin L., *Science and Information Theory* (Academic Press, 1956).
Jaynes E. T., "Information Theory and Statistical Mechanics," *Physical Review* 106 (1957): 620–630; 108 (1957): 171–190.
Morowitz H. J., *Energy Flow in Biology: Biological Organization as a Problem in Thermal Physics* (Academic Press, 1968).
Morowitz H. J., *Beginnings of Cellular Life: Metabolism Recapitulates Biogenesis* (Yale University Press, 1992).
Phillips R. and Milo R., *Cell Biology by the Numbers* (Garland Science, 2015).
Hutchison C. A. et al., "Design and Synthesis of a Minimal Bacterial Genome," *Science* 351 (2016): aad6253.
England J. L., "Statistical Physics of Self-Replication," *Journal of Chemical Physics* 139 (2013): 121923.

Experimental and theoretical studies in abiogenesis and self-organization

Here belong classic and contemporary works on prebiotic chemistry, protocells, RNA-world hypotheses, autocatalytic networks, and non-equilibrium self-organization, including both experimental demonstrations and theoretical frameworks.

Oparin A. I., *The Origin of Life* (Macmillan, 1938).
Miller S. L., "A Production of Amino Acids Under Possible Primitive Earth Conditions," *Science* 117 (1953): 528–529.
Eigen M., "Selforganization of Matter and the Evolution of Biological Macromolecules," *Naturwissenschaften* 58 (1971): 465–523.
Gilbert W., "Origin of Life: The RNA World," *Nature* 319 (1986): 618.
Joyce G. F., "The Antiquity of RNA-Based Evolution," *Nature* 418 (2002): 214–221.
Szostak J. W., Bartel D. P., and Luisi P. L., "Synthesizing Life," *Nature* 409 (2001): 387–390.
Szostak J. W., "Protocells and the Origin of Life," *Cold Spring Harbor Perspectives in Biology* 4 (2012): a005462.

Kauffman S. A., *The Origins of Order: Self-Organization and Selection in Evolution* (Oxford University Press, 1993).
Nicolis G. and Prigogine I., *Self-Organization in Nonequilibrium Systems: From Dissipative Structures to Order Through Fluctuations* (Wiley, 1977).
Deamer D., *First Life: Discovering the Connections Between Stars, Cells, and How Life Began* (University of California Press, 2011).

Philosophical and theological treatments of science, atheism, and Logos

This subsection would gather works that explicitly address the metaphysical interpretation of science, critiques of reductive naturalism, and classical and contemporary treatments of Logos, reason, and the intelligibility of the world.

Barbour I. G., *Religion and Science: Historical and Contemporary Issues* (HarperCollins, 1997).
Polkinghorne J., *Science and Providence: God's Interaction with the World* (Templeton Foundation Press, 1989).
Polkinghorne J., *Reason and Reality: The Relationship between Science and Theology* (SPCK, 1991).
Plantinga A., *Where the Conflict Really Lies: Science, Religion, and Naturalism* (Oxford University Press, 2011).
Taylor C., *A Secular Age* (Belknap Press, 2007).
Nagel T., *Mind and Cosmos: Why the Materialist Neo-Darwinian Conception of Nature Is Almost Certainly False* (Oxford University Press, 2012).
Lewis C. S., *Miracles: A Preliminary Study* (Geoffrey Bles, 1947).
Lewis C. S., *The Abolition of Man* (Oxford University Press, 1943).
Hart D. B., *The Experience of God: Being, Consciousness, Bliss* (Yale University Press, 2013).
Dawkins R., *The Blind Watchmaker: Why the Evidence of Evolution Reveals a Universe Without Design* (W. W. Norton, 1986).
Dennett D. C., *Darwin's Dangerous Idea: Evolution and the Meanings of Life* (Simon & Schuster, 1995).

Additional sources on Lyapunov stability, attractors, and living systems

Finally, this subsection would list technical and conceptual works on dynamical systems, Lyapunov stability, attractors, and their application to biological organization, systems biology, and theoretical biology.

Strogatz S. H., *Nonlinear Dynamics and Chaos: With Applications to Physics, Biology, Chemistry, and Engineering*, 2nd ed. (Westview Press, 2015).
Hirsch M. W., Smale S., and Devaney R. L., *Differential Equations, Dynamical Systems, and an Introduction to Chaos*, 3rd ed. (Academic Press, 2012).

Milnor J., “On the Concept of Attractor,” *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 99 (1985): 177–195.
Kauffman S. A., “Metabolic Stability and Epigenesis in Randomly Constructed Genetic Nets,” *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 22 (1969): 437–467.
Kitano H. (ed.), *Foundations of Systems Biology* (MIT Press, 2001).
Maturana H. R. and Varela F. J., *Autopoiesis and Cognition: The Realization of the Living* (D. Reidel, 1980).
Rosen R., *Life Itself: A Comprehensive Inquiry into the Nature, Origin, and Fabrication of Life* (Columbia University Press, 1991).
Nicolis G. and Prigogine I., *Exploring Complexity: An Introduction* (W. H. Freeman, 1989).
Schneider E. D. and Kay J. J., “Life as a Manifestation of the Second Law of Thermodynamics,” in *What Is Life? The Next Fifty Years*, ed. M. P. Murphy and L. A. J. O’Neill (Cambridge University Press, 1995), 161–174.

The author has published over 4,600 AI-assisted papers at: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Douglas-Youvan/research . Google Scholar has indexed these preprints, and if you want a particular reference, the AI mode of a Google search (Gemini) has efficiently catalogued these preprints.